U.S. Application No.: 10/597,072 Attorney Docket No.: 2261.0050000

Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 11-13 are pending in

the application, with claim 1 being the independent claim. Claims 1-3, 5, and 6 have been

amended. Claims 11-13 have been added. Claims 4 and 7-10 have been cancelled without

prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof. These changes are believed to

introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 and 5-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being

unpatentable over Doornbos (U.S. Patent No. 6,848,759) in view of Coleman (U.S. Patent

No. 5,448,797). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to remaining

claims 1-3, 5 and 6.

Doornbos does not teach that its buffering member (16) is rotated to directly or

indirectly press the case body or a member fixed to the case body to buffer same. Further, the

buffering member is not rotatably attached to slider (20). The slider and buffering member

are formed integrally. In the present invention, on the contrary, the "buffering member [is]

rotatably attached to the slider;" and "the buffering member is formed to be independent of

the slider."

In Doornbos, the slider is lifted from the detent (54), i.e., it is rotated, to linearly slide

in a longitudinal direction. In the present invention, on the other hand, the slider is "provided

in the case body so as to be slidable in a longitudinal direction of the case body but not to be

rotatable." Thus the slider does not deflect in a longitudinal direction of the case body, but

merely slides linearly in a longitudinal direction. This permits a smooth slider movement.

-5-

Reply to Office Action dated April 16, 2009

U.S. Application No.: 10/597,072

Attorney Docket No.: 2261.0050000

Coleman does not teach a buffering member being rotated through abutment with an engagement member, as in the herein claimed invention. Coleman's cam (38) is not rotated through abutment with the engagement member.

Even if it were possible to combine the teachings of Doornbos and Coleman, such combination would not render Applicant's invention obvious for the reasons that the abovedescribed features of the present invention would still be missing from the combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1-3, 5 and 6 be withdrawn.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Doornbos and Coleman as applied to claims 1-3 and 5-9 above, and further in view of Atkinson (U.S. Patent No. 5,179,134). Claim 4 has been canceled by the above amendments. This ground of rejection is therefore rendered moot.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable C) over Doornbos and Coleman as applied to claims 1-3 and 5-9 above, and further in view of Rusiana (U.S. Patent 6,253,417). Claim 10 has been canceled by the above amendments. This ground of rejection is therefore rendered moot.

New Claims

Claims 11-13 have been added by the foregoing amendments. Clams 11-13 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1. Claim 1 is patentable over the references of record for the reasons discussed above. Claims 11-13 are therefore also patentable for at least the same reasons, in addition to their own respective distinctive features.

U.S. Application No.: 10/597,072 Attorney Docket No.: 2261.0050000

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed,

accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the

Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be

withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the

outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite

prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the

number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully

requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Edward J. Kessler

Attorney for Applicant Registration No. 25,688

Date: October 7, 2009

1100 New York Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005-3934

(202) 371-2600

1000234.v1

-7-